REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action dated December 28, 2007. By this communication, claim 1 is amended. Support for the changes recited in claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 9, lines 1-25 of the disclosure. Claims 1-6 remain pending where claims 7-20 were previously cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to address the Examiner's concerns. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over *Duboc, Jr. et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,541,473) in view of Applicants' so-called admitted prior art (AAPA). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Office alleges that *Duboc, Jr.* teaches a laminated structure of layers to form a mesh grid into a plate. The mesh grid structure of *Duboc, Jr.* does not appear to be analogous to Applicants' claimed features. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the mesh grid is a metal plate.

The laminated grid structure described by *Duboc*, *Jr.* cannot reasonably be considered a metal plate. *Duboc*, *Jr.* discloses that the laminated grid structure is constructed from ceramic material so that the grid can be shaped into planar or curved forms and fired into a strong, rigid, and vacuum compatible grid. *Duboc*, *Jr.*

states that constructing the grid in this manner and from these materials provides advantages in that the thermal coefficient of expansion of the grid is closely matched with glass and other materials in a cathode ray tube (CRT), which minimizes separation problems and thermal stresses during manufacture and use of the CRT. See column 4, lines 9-19. Thus, *Duboc, Jr.* appears to teach away from the use of any materials including metal that do not embody the preceding characteristics for various techniques of forming a grid.

Even if one of ordinary skill were to look at *Lavoi* (U.S. Patent No. 5,424,605) as alleged by the Office, the skilled artisan would still not have the requisite knowledge to make or use Applicants' claimed metal grid. Lavoi discloses that a grid structure can be formed of laminated sheets of vacuum/electron beam compatible low temperature glass ceramic material, with conductive metal traces on surface layers, deposited prior to lamination. See column 5, lines 59-63. As a result, Lavoi does not remedy the acknowledged deficiencies of Duboc, Jr.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the documents cited by the Office describe a mesh grid that is formed of a metal plate as recited in Applicants' claims. As a result, a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 and its corresponding depending claims has not been established. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-6 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants request a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in even better form, Applicants request that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 17, 2008

Registration No. 51,522

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620